

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 10, 15, and 16 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

- (a) the amendments to claims 1, 10, 15, and 16 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and/or
- (b) the amendments to claims 1, 10, 15, and 16 do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised; and/or

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." (Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action at pages 2-5, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,151,708 to Pedrizetti, et al. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claim 1, as currently amended, is directed to a service processor control system and recites "the client receives the component information from the component information storage server, the component information including at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice," in which "the client displays the text manual and the diagram in a human-readable manner on the browser." Independent claims 10 and 15 are amended to recite similar features, support for which is found in the originally filed specification at least at page 16, lines 1-12.

As an advantage, in a non-limiting example, component information such as drawing information, various EC sheet information and the like can be extracted through a browser. Therefore, delivery maintenance can be conducted and the latest component information can be easily obtained with less labor and lower costs compared to a conventional system in which component information is delivered and maintained by paper mediums and the like. See Specification at page 22, lines 13-25.

In contrast, Pedrizetti, et al. only discusses a system for sending a list of available software updates in compact form, but does not discuss or suggest at least "component information including at least one text manual and a diagram of the product having a new design notice," in which "the client displays the text manual and the diagram in a human-readable manner," as recited in amended independent claims 1, 10, and 15.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1, 10, and 15 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Pedrizetti, et al. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention is characterized in that the instructions and display for system maintenance are performed using binary code. This allows for various items, such as manuals, specifications, design drawings, and such to be updated. More specifically, as recited in at least claims 3, 5, 11, 13, and the claims depending therefrom, the binary code used is XML. Accordingly, the human-machine interface of the present invention is widely available through many types of consoles or network without device drivers.

In contrast, Pedrizetti, et al. teaches the use of conventional data scanning in which data for scan-in and scan-out is obtained from a character set on a display, rather than from binary code, as in the present invention.

Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-16 patentably distinguish over Pedrizetti, et al.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 7, 2004
By: David M. Pitcher
David M. Pitcher
Registration No. 25,908

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501